

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,931	09/16/2003	John Higgins	03-029-JH	2331	
7590 06/22/2005			EXAMINER		
Melissa Patang		BUI, LUAN KIM			
Lambert and As 92 State Street	ssociates	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Boston, MA 02109			3728		
			DATE MAILED, 0000000		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					/				
Office Action Summary		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/663,93	1	HIGGINS, JOHN					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Luan K. Bu	i	3728					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no ever bly within the statut will apply and will be, cause the appli	ort, however, may a reply be time ory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commo	unication.				
Status	•								
1) 🏹	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 h	May 2005							
·	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This action is non-final.								
3)	,—								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1,4,8 and 12-17 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,4,8 and 12-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers	awn from con							
	·		·						
·	The specification is objected to by the Examina	· _	7 - 12 - 24 - 34 - 15 - 16 - 1	-					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc				,				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			* *	1 101/4)				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•	•		` ,				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have beer nts have beer prity docume au (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicati nts have been receive 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	age				
Attachmer	ut(s)								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary						
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	,	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-15)	2)				

Application/Control Number: 10/663,931 Page 2

Art Unit: 3728

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 4 and 8 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartell et al. (4,889,236; hereinafter Bartell'236). Bartell'236 discloses a rigid credit card style pill card having the peripheral dimensions of a credit card/wallet pill card (column 1, lines 66-68) comprising a card (10) having a top surface (100, 120) and a bottom surface (130, 400), and the card including at least one sealed cavity (30) located on the top surface at the perimeter edge of the card. As to claims 4 and 8, the sealed cavity of Bartell'236 is inherently capable to contain oral medical tablets or a tube of medicament.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 12-17 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartell et al. (4,889,236; hereinafter Bartell'236) in view of Mattis et al. (2002/0066690; hereinafter Mattis'690) and Robertson (6,516,950). Bartell'236 discloses the rigid credit card style pill card as above having all the limitations of the claims except for the card comprises a

Art Unit: 3728

thickness thinner or the same thickness as a credit card. Mattis'690 suggests a pill case (10) having the dimensions approximately of a credit card so that the case may be readily transported and carried in a wallet or billfold (page 1, paragraph 0009). Robertson teaches a credit card-sized carrier (10) having a length and width of substantially no greater than a standard credit card and a thickness is substantially no greater than about two or three times of the standard credit card so the carrier may be readily transported in a pocket or wallet. Robertson further teaches the carrier having indicia (72) such as information about the user or instructions relating to the enclosed drug for example aspirin for use of a heart attack. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in view of Mattis'690 and Robertson to modify the card of Bartell'236 so the card having the same thickness as a credit card to facilitate carrying in a wallet since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

As to claims 13-16, Bartell further discloses the card includes writing (20). However, Bartell'236 fails to show the writing is instructions or advertisement. Robertson shows the top surface of the cover (42) comprises the indicia (72) and the indicia include an information and instructions relating to the enclosed pill or the indicia may be information about the user (column 4, lines 51-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in view of Robertson to modify the card of Bartell'236 so the top surface includes writing and the writing comprises instructions relating to the enclosed pill or an advertisement to provide more convenience for the user.

As to claim 17, Bartell'236 further fails to show a cavity resealing mechanism. Robertson shows the card comprising a cavity (94) for holding the pill (96) and a cavity resealing mechanism (100) for multiple uses. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in view of Robertson to modify the card of Bartell'236 so it includes a cavity resealing mechanism for reusing the card.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/12/2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to Bartell'236 or Mattis'690 or Robertson are noted.

They are not persuasive for the reasons as set forth above.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 10/663,931

Art Unit: 3728

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan K. Bui whose telephone number is (571) 272-4552. If in receiving this Office Action, it is apparent to Applicant that certain documents are missing from the record for example copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Ms. Errica Miller at (571) 272-4370.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5648. Facsimile correspondence for this application should be sent to (703) 872-9306 for Formal papers and After Final communications.

lkb June 17, 2005 Luan K. Bui Primary Examiner

Page 5